

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of APRIL LASHAWN CHANDLER
and VEDAL BELGUIM CHANDLER, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SANDRA NELL ROWLAND,

Respondent-Appellant.

In the Matter of SHAWNDRIKA LANETTE
PULLIAM, LAVAR STERLING PULLIAM,
CIMARRON DALEON PULLIAM, and DALTON
JAY PULLIAM, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SANDRA NELL ROWLAND,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
February 16, 2006

No. 264438
Saginaw Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-025307-NA

No. 264439
Saginaw Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-025308-NA

In the Matter of SHAWNDRIKA LANETTE
PULLIAM, LAVAR STERLING PULLIAM,
CIMARRON DALEON PULLIAM, and DALTON
JAY PULLIAM, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WALTER PULLIAM,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 264440
Saginaw Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-025308-NA

Before: Borrello, P.J., and Sawyer and Fitzgerald, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent mother appeals as of right from an order terminating her parental rights to her six minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). Respondent father appeals as of right from the same order terminating his parental rights to his four children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

The trial court did not err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). At the time the children were made temporary wards, respondent mother's alcoholism was at issue. She admitted that her use of alcohol significantly impaired her ability to parent. The children were not consistently sent to school, and respondent mother owed significant sums on her utilities. Still, respondent mother did not take adequate steps to address her alcoholism. She claimed that she attended AA weekly, but she failed to bring proof of her attendance to court. Additionally, she admitted that the prescribed twelve-step program required participants to attend three meetings a week. When questioned by the court regarding why she did not attend as required even though she had the time, respondent mother simply replied that she did not have an answer to that question. She seemed confident that her drinking was under control, but she did nothing to inspire such confidence in the court or caseworkers. Significantly, respondent mother missed 24 urine drops in the time leading up to the termination petition.

Other major issues in respondent mother's case were employment, housing, and therapy. She did nothing to address any of these issues. Respondent mother was assigned three different caseworkers from Saginaw Psychological Services and failed to follow through with any of them. Respondent mother admitted that she stopped the services despite knowing that such

services were a prerequisite to reunification with her children. Respondent mother was dropped from the Work First program because of her failure to attend. She offered no reasonable explanation for her poor attendance other than the fact that she had been mugged on the way home from one of the meetings. Respondent mother said she had a hundred applications with various employers, but she worked a total of two days during the entire time her children were in care. She admitted that she looked to other family members for financial support. Also significant was respondent mother's lack of housing. She admitted that she moved from her sister's home to her mother's home and was often without a place to live. Respondent mother stressed the fact that she had housing at a home where she had taken care of an elderly gentleman, but she also admitted that she had no legal right to remain there and could have been removed at the owner's request at any time.

The trial court properly terminated respondent father's parental rights as well. Respondent father did absolutely nothing to avail himself of any services. He felt that his parenting was not at issue because the children were with their mother when they were made temporary wards. However, respondent father failed to show that he provided the children with any support, financial or otherwise, during that time. His own self-serving testimony was all that was offered into evidence. He claimed to make \$25,000 a year but admitted that he did not pay support during that time because he was being paid under the table and was not receiving paychecks. The father failed to specify in what way he supported his children or acted like an appropriate parent. With regard to housing, respondent father lived with respondent mother at a home in which neither of them had a legal right to stay.

Having found that there was a statutory basis for termination, the trial court was required to terminate respondents' parental rights unless there was clear evidence on the whole record that termination was not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There was evidence that neither parent took full advantage of their right to visit the children. Respondents may have loved the children, but the children were entitled to stability. Neither respondent made progress in demonstrating an ability to care for the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello
/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald